

REMARKS

The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for thoroughly reviewing and considering the pending application. The Office Action dated December 22, 2005 has been received and carefully reviewed. Claims 1, 3, and 4 have been amended. New claims 6 and 7 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-7 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by KR 10-2001-0037081 to *Lee et al.* (hereinafter "*Lee*"). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, "the reference must teach every element of the claim." The Applicants respectfully submit that *Lee* does not teach every element recited in claims 1 and 2. Thus, *Lee* cannot anticipate these claims. More specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite a method of controlling a drum-type washing machine which includes "detecting and comparing with a critical value a rotational speed of the motor after completion of the dewatering step." In addition, claim 1 has been amended to recite controlling the driving of the motor, after completion of the dewatering step, to apply a force to the drum "after the step of detecting and comparing." The Applicants submit that *Lee* does not disclose any of these features. Accordingly, claim 1, along with claim 2 which depends therefrom, is patentable over *Lee* and the Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action also rejected claims 2-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lee* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0046962 to *Sonoda et al.* (hereinafter "*Sonoda*") and JP 05-269292 to *Yoshiyuki* (hereinafter "*Yoshiyuki*"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to “establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” The Applicants respectfully submit that neither *Lee*, *Sonoda*, nor *Yoshiyuki*, either singularly or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every element recited in claims 2-5.

As previously discussed, *Lee* fails to disclose each and every element recited in claim 1, the base claim from which claims 2-5 depend. Similarly, neither *Sonoda* nor *Yoshiyuki*, either singularly or in combination, address the previously noted shortcomings of *Lee*. Accordingly, the Applicants submit that claims 2-5 are patentable over the cited references and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Applicants have also added new claims 6 and 7. The Applicants submit that these claims include subject matter not disclosed in the prior art and are therefore allowable.

The application is in a condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner believes a conversation with the Applicant’s representative would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

Application No.: 10/720,682
Amdt. dated March 10, 2006
Reply to Office Action dated December 22, 2005

Docket No.: 9988.088.00

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: March 10, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By


Mark R. Kresloff

Registration No.: 42,766

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant